

Exhibit 16

SUSAN G. KUPFER (Cal. Bar No. 141724)
GLANCY PRONGAY & MURRAY LLP
1808 Sixth Street
Berkeley, CA 94710
(415) 972-8160
skupfer@glancylaw.com

*Counsel for Dana Ross and
Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

**IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)
ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

Case No. 3:07-cv-5944
MDL No. 1917

CLASS ACTION

This Document Relates to:
All Indirect Purchaser Actions

**DECLARATION OF SUSAN G. KUPFER
IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS'
APPLICATION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES,
EXPENSES AND INCENTIVE AWARDS**

Judge: Honorable Samuel Conti
Courtroom One, 17th Floor

1 I, Susan G. Kupfer, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice before the courts of California and
3 Massachusetts and the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California and am a Partner
4 in the law firm Glancy Prongay & Murray LLP, formerly Glancy Binkow & Goldberg LLP. I
5 have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this declaration and, if called as a witness, I could
6 and would testify competently to them. I make this declaration in support of my firm's request for
7 attorneys' fees and reimbursement of litigation expenses, as set forth in Plaintiffs' Application for
8 Attorneys' Fees, Expenses and Incentive Awards.

9 2. My firm is counsel of record in this case, and represents named plaintiff Dana Ross.
10 A brief description of my firm is attached as Exhibit 1 and incorporated by reference.

11 3. Throughout the course of this litigation, my firm kept files contemporaneously
12 documenting all time spent, including tasks performed, and expenses incurred, and transmitted
13 those reports on a regular basis to Lead Counsel. All of the time and expenses reported by my firm
14 were incurred for the benefit of the Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs ("IPPs").

15 4. During the course of this litigation, my firm has been involved in the following
16 tasks and activities on behalf of the IPPs. All of this work was assigned and/or approved by Lead
17 Counsel.

- 18 • Investigated the underlying industry and the plaintiffs' claims
- 19 • Advised in the preparation of the amended complaint and provided background
20 information and edits for same
- 21 • Advised the firm's client, Dana Ross, and worked with him on responses to
22 document discovery
- 23 • Researched and prepared briefing for Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendants' Motion
24 to Dismiss
- 25 • Researched and prepared briefing for FTAIA issues
- 26 • Performed review and analysis of defendants' document production
- 27 • Organized defendants' documents and prepared analyses in preparation for
28

1 depositions

- 2 • Translated defendants' documents from the Japanese language

3 5. The schedule attached as Exhibit 2, and incorporated, is a detailed summary of the
4 amount of time spent by my firm's partners, attorneys and professional support staff who were
5 involved in this litigation. It does not include any time devoted to preparing this declaration or
6 otherwise pertaining to the Joint Fee Petition. The lodestar calculation is based on my firm's
7 historical billing rates in effect at the time services were performed. Exhibit 2 was prepared from
8 contemporaneous time records regularly prepared and maintained by my firm. Those records have
9 been provided to Lead Counsel and I authorize them to be submitted for inspection by the Court if
10 necessary. The hourly rates for my firm's partners, attorneys and professional support staff
11 included in Exhibit 2 were at the time the work was performed the usual and customary hourly
12 rates charged for their services in similar complex litigation.

13 6. The total number of hours reasonably expended on this litigation by my firm from
14 inception to May 31, 2015 is 5,358 hours. The total lodestar for my firm at historical rates is
15 \$2,200,038.50. The total lodestar for my firm at current rates is \$2,214,555.75. Expense items are
16 billed separately and are not duplicated in my firm's lodestar.

17 7. The expenses my firm incurred in litigating this action are reflected in the books
18 and records of my firm. These books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices,
19 receipts, check records and other source materials and accurately reflect the expenses incurred.
20 My firm's expense records are available for inspection by the Court if necessary.

21 8. My firm incurred a total of \$51,977.84 in unreimbursed expenses, all of which were
22 reasonable and necessary for the prosecution of this litigation. Of this amount, \$45,000.00 was for
23 assessment payments for common litigation expenses or direct payments to experts or other
24 vendors made at the request of Lead Counsel, and an additional \$6,977.84 was for non-common
25 litigation expenses incurred by my firm, such as travel, meals and lodging, copying, legal research,
26 telephone, etc. A summary of those expenses by category is attached as Exhibit 3.

1 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 21st
2 day of August, 2015, in Berkeley, California.

3 /s/

Susan Kupfer

EXHIBIT 1

GLANCY PRONGAY & MURRAY LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

NEW YORK OFFICE

122 EAST 42ND STREET
SUITE 2920
NEW YORK, NY 10168
TELEPHONE (212) 682-5340
FACSIMILE (212) 884-0988

1925 CENTURY PARK EAST
SUITE 2100
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067

TELEPHONE (310) 201-9150
FACSIMILE (310) 201-9160
info@glancylaw.com

BERKELEY OFFICE

1808 SIXTH STREET
BERKELEY, CA 94710
TELEPHONE (415) 972-8160
FACSIMILE (415) 972-8166

FIRM RESUME

Glancy Prongay & Murray LLP (the “Firm”) has represented investors, consumers and employees for 25 years. Based in Los Angeles with offices in New York City and Berkeley, the Firm has successfully prosecuted class action cases and complex litigation in federal and state courts throughout the country. As Lead Counsel or as a member of Plaintiffs’ Counsel Executive Committees, the Firm has recovered billions of dollars for parties wronged by corporate fraud and malfeasance. Indeed, the Institutional Shareholder Services unit of RiskMetrics Group has recognized the Firm as one of the top plaintiffs’ law firms in the United States in its Securities Class Action Services report for every year since the inception of the report in 2003. The Firm’s efforts have been publicized in major newspapers such as the *Wall Street Journal*, the *New York Times*, and the *Los Angeles Times*.

Glancy Prongay & Murray’s commitment to high quality and excellent personalized services has boosted its national reputation, and we are now recognized as one of the premier plaintiffs’ firms in the country. The Firm works tenaciously on behalf of clients to produce significant results and generate lasting corporate reform.

The Firm’s integrity and success originate from our attorneys, who are among the brightest and most experienced in the field. Our distinguished litigators have an unparalleled track record of investigating and prosecuting corporate wrongdoing. The Firm is respected for both the zealous advocacy with which we represent our clients’ interests as well as the highly-professional and ethical manner by which we achieve results. We are ideally positioned to interpret securities litigation, consumer litigation, antitrust litigation, and derivative and corporate takeover litigation. The Firm’s outstanding accomplishments are the direct result of the exceptional talents of our attorneys and employees.

Appointed as Lead or Co-Lead Counsel by judges throughout the United States, Glancy Prongay & Murray has achieved significant recoveries for class members, including:

In re Mercury Interactive Corporation Securities Litigation, USDC Northern District of California, Case No. 05-3395, in which the Firm served as Co-Lead Counsel and achieved a settlement valued at over \$117 million.

In re Real Estate Associates Limited Partnership Litigation, USDC Central District of California, Case No. 98-7035 DDP, in which the Firm served as local counsel and plaintiffs achieved a \$184 million jury verdict after a complex six week trial in Los Angeles, California and later settled the case for \$83 million.

The City of Farmington Hills Employees Retirement System v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., USDC District of Minnesota, Case No. 10-cv-04372-DWF/JJG, in which the Firm served as Co-Lead Counsel and achieved a settlement valued at \$62.5 million.

In re Lumenis, Ltd. Securities Litigation, USDC Southern District of New York, Case No. 02-CV-1989, in which the Firm served as Co-Lead Counsel and achieved a settlement valued at over \$20 million.

In re Heritage Bond Litigation, USDC Central District of California, Case No. 02-ML-1475-DT, where as Co-Lead Counsel, the Firm recovered in excess of \$28 million for defrauded investors and continues to pursue additional defendants.

In re ECI Telecom Ltd. Securities Litigation, USDC Eastern District of Virginia, Case No. 01-913-A, in which the Firm served as sole Lead Counsel and recovered almost \$22 million for defrauded ECI investors.

Jenson v. First Trust Corporation, USDC Central District of California, Case No. 05-cv-3124-ABC, in which the Firm was appointed sole lead counsel and achieved an \$8.5 million settlement in a very difficult case involving a trustee's potential liability for losses incurred by investors in a Ponzi scheme. Kevin Ruf of the Firm also successfully defended in the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals the trial court's granting of class certification in this case.

Yaldo v. Airtouch Communications, State of Michigan, Wayne County, Case No. 99-909694-CP, in which the Firm served as Co-Lead Counsel and achieved a settlement valued at over \$32 million for defrauded consumers.

In re Infonet Services Corporation Securities Litigation, USDC Central District of California, Case No. CV 01-10456 NM, in which as Co-Lead Counsel, the Firm achieved a settlement of \$18 million.

In re Musicmaker.com Securities Litigation, USDC Central District of California, Case No. 00-02018, a securities fraud class action in which the Firm was sole Lead Counsel for the Class and recovered in excess of \$13 million.

In re ESC Medical Systems, Ltd. Securities Litigation, USDC Southern District of New York, Case No. 98 Civ. 7530, a securities fraud class action in which the Firm served as sole Lead Counsel for the Class and achieved a settlement valued in excess of \$17 million.

In re Lason, Inc. Securities Litigation, USDC Eastern District of Michigan, Case No. 99 76079, in which the Firm was Co-Lead Counsel and recovered almost \$13 million for defrauded Lason stockholders.

In re Inso Corp. Securities Litigation, USDC District of Massachusetts, Case No. 99 10193, a securities fraud class action in which the Firm served as Co-Lead Counsel for the Class and achieved a settlement valued in excess of \$12 million.

In re National TechTeam Securities Litigation, USDC Eastern District of Michigan, Case No. 97-74587, a securities fraud class action in which the Firm served as Co-Lead Counsel for the Class and achieved a settlement valued in excess of \$11 million.

In re Ramp Networks, Inc. Securities Litigation, USDC Northern District of California, Case No. C-00-3645 JCS, a securities fraud class action in which the Firm served as Co-Lead Counsel for the Class and achieved a settlement of nearly \$7 million.

In re Gilat Satellite Networks, Ltd. Securities Litigation, USDC Eastern District of New York, Case No. 02-1510 CPS, a securities fraud class action in which the Firm served as Co-Lead Counsel for the Class and achieved a settlement of \$20 million.

Taft v. Ackermans (KPNQwest Securities Litigation), USDC Southern District of New York, Case No. 02-CV-07951, a securities fraud class action in which the Firm served as Co-Lead Counsel for the Class and achieved a settlement worth \$11 million.

Ree v. Procom Technologies, Inc., USDC Southern District of New York, Case No. 02CV7613, a securities fraud class action in which the Firm served as Co-Lead Counsel for the Class and achieved a settlement of \$2.7 million.

Capri v. Comerica, Inc., USDC Eastern District of Michigan, Case No. 02CV60211 MOB, a securities fraud class action in which the Firm served as Co-Lead Counsel for the Class and achieved a settlement of \$6.0 million.

Tatz v. Nanophase Technologies Corp., USDC Northern District of Illinois, Case No. 01C8440, a securities fraud class action in which the Firm served as Co-Lead Counsel for the Class and achieved a settlement of \$2.5 million.

In re Livent, Inc. Noteholders Litigation, USDC Southern District of New York, Case No. 99 Civ 9425, a securities fraud class action in which the Firm served as Co-Lead Counsel for the Class and achieved a settlement of over \$27 million.

Plumbing Solutions Inc. v. Plug Power, Inc., USDC Eastern District of New York, Case No. CV 00 5553 (ERK) (RML), a securities fraud class action in which the Firm served as Co-Lead Counsel for the Class and achieved a settlement of over \$5 million.

Schleicher v. Wendt, (Conseco Securities Litigation), USDC Southern District of Indiana, Case No. 02-1332 SEB, a securities fraud class action in which the Firm served as Lead Counsel for the Class and achieved a settlement of over \$41 million.

Lapin v. Goldman Sachs, USDC Southern District of New York, Case No. 03-0850-KJD, a securities fraud class action in which the Firm served as Co-Lead Counsel for the Class and achieved a settlement of \$29 million.

Senn v. Sealed Air Corporation, USDC New Jersey, Case No. 03-cv4372, a securities fraud class action, in which the Firm acted as co-lead counsel for the Class and achieved a settlement of \$20 million.

The Firm filed the initial landmark antitrust lawsuit against all of the major NASDAQ market makers and served on Plaintiffs' Counsel's Executive Committee in In re Nasdaq Market-Makers Antitrust Litigation, USDC Southern District of New York, Case No. 94 C 3996 (RWS), MDL Docket No. 1023, which recovered \$900 million for investors in numerous heavily traded Nasdaq issues.

Glancy Prongay & Murray has also previously acted as Class Counsel in obtaining substantial benefits for shareholders in a number of actions, including:

In re F & M Distributors Securities Litigation,
Eastern District of Michigan, Case No. 95 CV 71778 DT (Executive Committee Member)
(\$20.25 million settlement)

James F. Schofield v. McNeil Partners, L.P. Securities Litigation,
California Superior Court, County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC 133799

Resources High Equity Securities Litigation,
California Superior Court, County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC 080254

The Firm has served and currently serves as Class Counsel in a number of antitrust class actions, including:

In re Nasdaq Market-Makers Antitrust Litigation,
USDC Southern District of New York, Case No. 94 C 3996 (RWS), MDL Docket No. 1023

In re Brand Name Prescription Drug Antitrust Litigation,
USDC Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, Case No. 94 C 897

Glancy Prongay & Murray has been responsible for obtaining favorable appellate opinions which have broken new ground in the class action or securities fields, or which have promoted shareholder rights in prosecuting these actions. The Firm successfully argued the appeals in a number of cases:

In Smith v. L'Oreal, 39 Cal.4th 77 (2006), Firm partner Kevin Ruf established ground-breaking law when the California Supreme Court agreed with the Firm's position that waiting penalties under the California Labor Code are available to *any* employee after termination of employment, regardless of the reason for that termination.

Other notable Firm cases are: Silber v. Mabon I, 957 F.2d 697 (9th Cir. 1992) and Silber v. Mabon II, 18 F.3d 1449 (9th Cir. 1994), which are the leading decisions in the Ninth Circuit regarding the rights of opt-outs in class action settlements. In Rothman v. Gregor, 220 F.3d 81 (2d Cir. 2000), the Firm won a seminal victory for investors before the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, which adopted a more favorable pleading standard for investors in reversing the District Court's dismissal of the investors' complaint. After this successful appeal, the Firm then recovered millions of dollars for defrauded investors of the GT Interactive Corporation. The Firm also argued Falkowski v. Imation Corp., 309 F.3d 1123 (9th Cir. 2002), *as amended*, 320 F.3d 905 (9th Cir. 2003) and favorably obtained the substantial reversal of a lower court's dismissal of a cutting edge, complex class action initiated to seek redress for a group of employees whose stock options were improperly forfeited by a giant corporation in the course of its sale of the subsidiary at which they worked. The revived action is currently proceeding in the California state court system.

The Firm is also involved in the representation of individual investors in court proceedings throughout the United States and in arbitrations before the American Arbitration Association, National Association of Securities Dealers, New York Stock Exchange, and Pacific Stock Exchange. Mr. Glancy has successfully represented litigants in proceedings against such major securities firms and insurance companies as A.G. Edwards & Sons, Bear Stearns, Merrill Lynch & Co., Morgan Stanley, PaineWebber, Prudential, and Shearson Lehman Brothers.

One of the Firm's unique skills is the use of "group litigation" - the representation of groups of individuals who have been collectively victimized or defrauded by large institutions. This type of litigation brought on behalf of individuals who have been similarly damaged often provides an efficient and effective economic remedy that frequently has advantages over the class action or individual action devices. The Firm has successfully achieved results for groups of individuals in cases against major corporations such as Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, and Occidental Petroleum Corporation.

Glancy Prongay & Murray LLP currently consists of the following attorneys:

PARTNERS

LEE ALBERT, a partner, was admitted to the bars of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the State of New Jersey, and the United States District Courts for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and the District of New Jersey in 1986. He received his B.S. and M.S. degrees from Temple University and Arcadia University in 1975 and 1980, respectively, and received his J.D. degree from Widener University School of Law in 1986. Upon graduation from law school, Mr. Albert spent several years working as a civil litigator in Philadelphia, PA. Mr. Albert has extensive litigation and appellate practice experience having argued before the Supreme and Superior Courts of Pennsylvania and has over fifteen years of trial experience in both jury and

non-jury cases and arbitrations. Mr. Albert has represented a national health care provider at trial obtaining injunctive relief in federal court to enforce a five-year contract not to compete on behalf of a national health care provider and injunctive relief on behalf of an undergraduate university.

Currently, Mr. Albert represents clients in all types of complex litigation including matters concerning violations of federal and state antitrust and securities laws, mass tort/product liability and unfair and deceptive trade practices. Some of Mr. Albert's current major cases include *In Re Automotive Wire Harness Systems Antitrust Litigation* (E.D. Mich.); *In Re Heater Control Panels Antitrust Litigation* (E.D. Mich.); *Kleen Products, et al. v. Packaging Corp. of America* (N.D. Ill.); and *In re Class 8 Transmission Indirect Purchaser Antitrust Litigation* (D. Del.). Previously, Mr. Albert had a significant role in *Marine Products Antitrust Litigation* (C.D. Cal.); *Baby Products Antitrust Litigation* (E.D. Pa.); *In re ATM Fee Litigation* (N.D. Cal.); *In re Canadian Car Antitrust Litigation* (D. Me.); *In re Broadcom Securities Litigation* (C.D. Cal.); and has worked on *In re Avandia Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation* (E.D. Pa.); *In re Ortho Evra Birth Control Patch Litigation* (N.J. Super. Ct., Middlesex County); *In re AOL Time Warner, Inc. Securities Litigation* (S.D.N.Y.); *In re WorldCom, Inc. Securities Litigation* (S.D.N.Y.); and *In re Microsoft Corporation Massachusetts Consumer Protection Litigation* (Mass. Super. Ct.).

LOUIS BOYARSKY is a Partner in the Firm's Los Angeles office. Mr. Boyarsky supervises the Firm's Mergers & Acquisitions Practice and has served as lead, co-lead, and liaison counsel in corporate takeover actions in state and federal courts throughout the country. Cases in which Mr. Boyarsky has participated have achieved additional consideration for shareholders, substantive changes to merger agreements, and critical disclosures regarding proposed transactions. Mr. Boyarsky has also successfully prosecuted securities and derivative actions and has provided commentary to national media outlets on high-profile cases.

Mr. Boyarsky's recent litigation successes include *In Rae Systems, Inc. Shareholder Litigation*, where his efforts as a member of the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee helped lead to an increase of approximately \$13.1 million in merger consideration received by Rae Systems shareholders. As co-lead counsel in *In re HQ Sustainable Maritime Indus., Inc., Derivative Litigation*, Mr. Boyarsky achieved a \$2.75 million settlement on behalf of HQ's shareholders arising out of claims that HQ's board of directors breached their fiduciary duties to the company's shareholders by failing to maintain adequate internal controls. In *Susan Forbush v. Suffolk Bancorp et al.* Mr. Boyarsky's efforts achieved comprehensive corporate governance reform at the Company and the pendency of the litigation led to a near reconstitution of the Suffolk Bancorp's entire executive management team. Additionally, Mr. Boyarsky successfully argued before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Ronald Dennis v. Pico Holdings Inc. et al* 724 F.3d 1249 a novel issue with respect to whether the Dodd Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Reform Act creates federal jurisdiction over state law breach of fiduciary duty claims where there has been a failed shareholder say-on-pay vote.

Mr. Boyarsky received his JD/MBA from Loyola Law School, Los Angeles and Loyola Marymount University's Graduate School of Business. While in law school, Mr. Boyarsky published his article *Stealth Celebrity Testimonials of Prescription Drugs: Placing the Consumer in Harm's Way and How the FDA has Dropped the Ball*. Additionally, while in law school Mr.

Boyarsky externed for the Honorable Suzanne H. Segal, magistrate judge for the Central District of California. Mr. Boyarsky is a member of the St. Thomas More Legal Honor Society, the Alpha Sigma Nu National Jesuit Honor Society and the Beta Gamma Sigma Business Honor Society. Mr. Boyarsky is admitted to the State Bar of California, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and the United States District Courts for the Northern, Southern, and Central Districts of California.

In his free time, Mr. Boyarsky is active in his community and is currently a member of the Anti-Defamation League's Glass Leadership Institute.

JOSHUA L. CROWELL, a partner in the firm's Los Angeles office, concentrates his practice on prosecuting complex securities cases on behalf of investors. Recently he helped achieve a successful resolution of the Hansen Medical, Inc., securities action, No. C 09-5094 CW (N.D. Cal.), resulting in a settlement of \$8.5 million for the shareholder class.

Prior to joining Glancy Prongay & Murray LLP, Joshua was an Associate at Labaton Sucharow LLP in New York, where he helped secure several large federal securities class settlements in cases such as *In re Countrywide Financial Corporation Securities Litigation*, No. CV 07-05295 MRP (MANx) (C.D. Cal.) (\$624 million), and the Oppenheimer Champion Fund and Core Bond Fund actions, Nos. 09-cv-525-JLK-KMT and 09-cv-1186-JLK-KMT (D. Colo.) (\$100 million combined). He began his legal career as an Associate at Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP in New York, primarily representing financial services clients in commercial litigation.

Prior to attending law school, Joshua was a Senior Economics Consultant at Ernst & Young LLP, where he priced intercompany transactions and calculated the value of intellectual property. Joshua received a J.D., *cum laude*, from The George Washington University Law School. During law school, he was an Associate of *The George Washington Law Review* and a member of the Mock Trial Board. He was also a law intern for Chief Judge Edward J. Damich of the United States Court of Federal Claims. Joshua earned a B.A. in International Relations from Carleton College.

LIONEL Z. GLANCY, a graduate of University of Michigan Law School, is the founding partner of the Firm. After serving as a law clerk for United States District Judge Howard McKibben, he began his career as an associate at a New York law firm concentrating in securities litigation. Thereafter, he started a boutique law firm specializing in securities litigation, and other complex litigation, from the Plaintiff's perspective. Mr. Glancy has established a distinguished career in the field of securities litigation over the last fifteen years, having appeared and been appointed lead counsel on behalf of aggrieved investors in securities class action cases throughout the country. He has appeared and argued before dozen of district courts and a number of appellate courts. His efforts have resulted in the recovery of hundreds of millions of dollars in settlement proceeds for huge classes of shareholders. Well known in securities law, he has lectured on its developments and practice, including having lectured before Continuing Legal Education seminars and law schools.

Mr. Glancy was born in Windsor, Canada, on April 4, 1962. Mr. Glancy earned his undergraduate degree in political science in 1984 and his Juris Doctor degree in 1986, both from

the University of Michigan. He was admitted to practice in California in 1988, and in Nevada and before the U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, in 1989.

MARC L. GODINO has extensive experience successfully litigating complex, class action lawsuits as a plaintiffs' lawyer. Mr. Godino has played a primary role in cases resulting in settlements of more than \$100 million. He has prosecuted securities, derivative, merger & acquisition, and consumer cases throughout the country in both state and federal court, as well as represented defrauded investors at FINRA arbitrations. Mr. Godino manages the Firm's consumer class action department.

While an associate with Stull Stull & Brody, Mr. Godino was one of the two primary attorneys involved in *Small v. Fritz Co.*, 30 Cal. 4th 167 (April 7, 2003), in which the California Supreme Court created new law in the State of California for shareholders that held shares in detrimental reliance on false statements made by corporate officers. The decision was widely covered by national media including *The National Law Journal*, the *Los Angeles Times*, the *New York Times*, and the *New York Law Journal*, among others, and was heralded as a significant victory for shareholders.

Successes with the firm include: *Ord v. First National Bank of Pennsylvania*, Case No. 12-766 (W. D. Pa.) (\$3,000,000 cash settlement plus injunctive relief); *Pappas v. Naked Juice Co. of Glendora, Inc.*, Case No. 11-08276 (C.D. Cal.) (\$9,000,000 cash settlement plus injunctive relief); *Astiana v. Kashi Company*, Case No. 11-1967 (S.D. Cal.) (\$5,000,000 cash settlement); *In re Magma Design Automation, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 05-2394 (N.D. Cal.) (\$13,500,000.00 cash settlement for shareholders); *In re Hovnanian Enterprises, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 08-cv-0099 (D.N.J.) (\$4,000,000.00 cash settlement for shareholders); *In re Skilled Healthcare Group, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 09-5416 (C.D. Cal.) (\$3,000,000.00 cash settlement for shareholders); *Kelly v. Phiten USA, Inc.*, Case No. 11-67 (S.D. Iowa) (\$3.2 million dollar cash settlement in addition to injunctive relief); *Shin et al., v. BMW of North America*, 2009 WL 2163509 (C.D. Cal. July 16, 2009) (after defeating a motion to dismiss, the case settled on very favorable terms for class members including free replacement of cracked wheels); *Payday Advance Plus, Inc. v. MIVA, Inc.*, Case No. 06-1923 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$3,936,812 cash settlement for class members); *Esslinger, et al. v. HSBC Bank Nevada, N.A.*, Case No. 10-03213 (E.D. Pa.) (\$23.5 million settlement pending final approval); *In re Discover Payment Protection Plan Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation*, Case No. 10-06994 (\$10.5 million settlement pending final approval).

Other published decisions include: *Kramer v. Toyota Motor Corp.*, 705 F. 3d 1122 (9th Cir. 2013) (affirming denial of Defendant's motion to compel arbitration); *In re Zappos.com, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litigation*, 893 F. Supp. 2d 1058 (D. Nev. Sep 27, 2012) (motion to compel arbitration denied); *Sateriale v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.*, 697 F. 3d 777 (9th Cir. 2012) (reversing order dismissing class action complaint); *Lilly v. Jamba Juice Company*, 2014 WL 4652283 (N. D. Cal. Sep 18, 2014) (class certification granted in part); *Small v. University Medical Center of Southern Nevada*, 2013 WL 3043454 (D. Nev. June 14, 2013) (order granting conditional certification to FLSA class); *Peterson v. ConAgra Foods, Inc.*, 2014 WL 3741853 (S. D. Cal. July 29, 2014) (motion to dismiss denied); *In re 2TheMart.com Securities Litigation*, 114 F. Supp. 2d 955 (C.D. Cal. 2002) (motion to dismiss denied); *In re Irvine Sensors Securities Litigation*, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18397 (C.D. Cal. 2003) (motion to dismiss denied); *Shin v.*

BMW of North America, 2009 WL 2163509 (C.D. Cal. July 16, 2009) (motion to dismiss denied).

The following represent just a few of the more than two dozen cases Mr. Godino is currently litigating in a leadership position: In re Avon Anti-Aging Skincare Creams and Products Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation, Case No. 13-150 (S.D.N.Y.); PB Property Management, Inc. v. Goodman Manufacturing Company, L.P., et al., Case No. 12-1366 (M.D. Fl.); Grodzitsky v. American Honda Motor Co., Inc., Case No. 12-1142 (C.D. CA); Sciortino v. Pepsico, Inc., Case No. 14-478 (N.D. CA); Javorsky v. Western Athletic Clubs, Inc., Case No. 13-528384 (Sup. Ct. San Francisco).

Mr. Godino received his undergraduate degree from Susquehanna University with a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Management. He received his Juris Doctor degree from Whittier Law School in 1995.

Mr. Godino is admitted to practice before the State of California, the United States District Courts for the Central, Northern, and Southern Districts of California, the District of Colorado, and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

MARK S. GREENSTONE specializes in consumer, financial fraud and employment-related class actions. Possessing significant law and motion and trial experience, Mr. Greenstone has represented clients in multi-million dollar disputes in California state and federal courts, as well as the Court of Federal Claims in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Greenstone received his training as an associate at Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP where he specialized in complex business litigation relating to investment management, government contracts and real estate. Upon leaving Sheppard Mullin, Mr. Greenstone founded an internet-based company offering retail items on multiple platforms nationwide. He thereafter returned to law bringing a combination of business and legal skills to his practice.

Mr. Greenstone graduated Order of the Coif from the UCLA School of Law. He also received his undergraduate degree in Political Science from UCLA, where he graduated Magna Cum Laude and was inducted into the Phi Beta Kappa honor society.

Mr. Greenstone is a member of the Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles, the Santa Monica Bar Association and the Beverly Hills Bar Association. He is admitted to practice in state and federal courts throughout California.

ROBIN BRONZAFT HOWALD, a native of Brooklyn, New York, returned home in 2001, after practicing for 18 years in Los Angeles, to open the Firm's New York City office.

Prior to joining the Firm in 2000, Mrs. Howald's diverse civil litigation practice included commercial disputes, professional malpractice, wrongful termination, bankruptcy, patent, public contract and construction matters. As outside counsel for the City of Torrance, California, she also handled a number of civil rights and land use matters, as well as a ground-breaking environmental action concerning Mobil Oil's Torrance refinery. She co-authored "Potential Tort Liability in Business Takeovers" (*California Lawyer*, September 1986), was a speaker and

contributing author at the Eighth Annual Current Environmental and Natural Resources Issues Seminar at the University of Kentucky College of Law (April 1991), and served as a Judge Pro Tem for the Los Angeles County Small Claims Court (1996-1997).

Mrs. Howald became a partner in the Firm in 2004 and has prosecuted both class action and individual cases which have recovered hundreds of millions of dollars for injured investors and consumers, including:

- *Schleicher, et al. v. Wendt, et al. (Conseco)*, Case No. 02-cv-1332 (S.D. Ind.) (\$41.5 million settlement);
- *Lapin v. Goldman Sachs*, Case No. 03-850 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$29 million settlement);
- *In Re: Mannkind Corporation Securities Litigation*, Case No. 11-929 (C.D. Cal) (approximately \$22 million settlement - \$16 million in cash plus stock);
- *In re ECI Telecom Ltd. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 01-913 (E.D. Va.) (\$21.75 million settlement);
- *In re Gilat Satellite Networks, Ltd.*, Case No. 02-1510 (E.D.N.Y.) (\$20 million settlement);
- *In re Infonet Services Corporation Securities Litigation*, Case No. 01-10456 (C.D. Cal.) (\$18 million settlement);
- *HCL Partners Limited Partnership, et al. v. Leap Wireless International, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 07-2245 (S.D. Cal.) (\$13.75 million settlement);
- *In re Musicmaker.com Securities Litigation*, Case No. 00-2018 (C.D. Cal.) (\$13 million settlement);
- *Taft v. Ackermans (KPNQuest)*, Case No. 02-7951 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$11 million settlement);
- *Jenson v. First Trust Corporation*, Case No. 05-3124 (C.D. Cal.) (\$8.5 million settlement);
- *In re Ramp Networks, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 00-3645 (N.D. Cal) (\$6.9 million settlement);
- *Childs, et al., v. Applied Digital Solutions, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 02-80468 (S.D. Fla.) (\$5.6 million settlement);
- *In re TTI Securities Litigation*, Case No. 04-4305 (D.N.J.) (\$4.3 million settlement);
- *In re Hovnanian Enterprises, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 08-0099 (D.N.J.) (\$4 million settlement);
- *Yanek, et al. v. STAAR Surgical Company, et al.*, Case No. 04-8007 (C.D. Cal.) (\$3.7 million settlement);
- *Wayne Szymborski, et al. v. Ormat Technologies, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 10-132 (D. Nev.) (\$3.1 million settlement);
- *Steve Crotteau, et al. v. Addus HomeCare Corporation, et al.*, Case No. 10-1937 (N.D. Ill) (\$3 million settlement);
- *Ree, et al v. Pinckert, et al (Cholestech)*, Case No. 99-562 (N.D. Cal.) (\$3 million settlement);
- *In re Skilled Healthcare Group, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 09-5416 (C.D. Cal.) (\$3 million settlement);
- *In re Atricare, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 08-867 (S.D. Ohio) (\$2.75 million settlement);
- *Ree v. Procom Technologies, Inc.*, Case No. 02-7613 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$2.7 million settlement);
- *Tatz v. Nanophase Technologies Corp.*, Case No. 01-8440 (N.D. Ill.) (\$2.5 million settlement);

- *In re Focus Enhancements, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 99-12344 (D. Mass.) (\$1.4 million settlement); and
- *In Re Allot Communications Ltd. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 07-03455 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$1.3 million settlement).

Married in 1985, Mrs. Howald and her husband have two sons. An avid distance runner since 1999, Mrs. Howald has run the Boston Marathon four times and completed 27 additional marathons.

SUSAN G. KUPFER is the founding partner of the Firm's Berkeley office and head of the Firm's Antitrust Practice Group. Ms Kupfer joined the Firm in 2003. She is a native of New York City, and received her A.B. degree from Mount Holyoke College in 1969 and her Juris Doctor degree from Boston University School of Law in 1973. She did graduate work at Harvard Law School and, in 1977, was named Assistant Dean and Director of Clinical Programs at Harvard, supervising and teaching in that program of legal practice and related academic components.

For much of her legal career, Ms. Kupfer has been a professor of law. Her areas of academic expertise are Civil Procedure, Federal Courts, Conflict of Laws, Constitutional Law, Legal Ethics, and Jurisprudence. She has taught at Harvard Law School, Hastings College of the Law, Boston University School of Law, Golden Gate University School of Law, and Northeastern University School of Law. From 1991 through 2002, she was a lecturer on law at the University of California, Berkeley, Boalt Hall, teaching Civil Procedure and Conflict of Laws. Her publications include articles on federal civil rights litigation, legal ethics, and jurisprudence. She has also taught various aspects of practical legal and ethical training, including trial advocacy, negotiation and legal ethics, to both law students and practicing attorneys.

Ms. Kupfer previously served as corporate counsel to The Architects Collaborative in Cambridge and San Francisco, and was the Executive Director of the Massachusetts Commission on Judicial Conduct. She returned to the practice of law in San Francisco with Morgenstein & Jubelirer and Berman DeValerio LLP before joining the Firm.

Ms. Kupfer's practice is concentrated in complex antitrust litigation. She currently serves, or has served, as Co-Lead Counsel in several multidistrict antitrust cases: *In re Photochromic Lens Antitrust Litig.* (MDL 2173, M.D. Fla. 2010); *In re Fresh and Process Potatoes Antitrust Litig.* (D. ID. 2011); *In re Korean Air Lines Antitrust Litig.* (MDL No. 1891, C.D. Cal. 2007); *In re Urethane Antitrust Litigation* (MDL 1616, D. Kan. 2004); *In re Western States Wholesale Natural Gas Litigation* (MDL 1566, D. Nev. 2005); and *Sullivan et al v. DB Investments et al* (D. N.J. 2004). She has been a member of the lead counsel teams that achieved significant settlements in: *In re Sorbates Antitrust Litigation* (\$96.5 million settlement); *In re Pillar Point Partners Antitrust Litigation* (\$50 million settlement); and *In re Critical Path Securities Litigation* (\$17.5 million settlement).

Ms. Kupfer is a member of the bar of Massachusetts and California, and is admitted to practice before the United States District Courts for the Northern, Central, Eastern and Southern Districts of California, the District of Massachusetts, the Courts of Appeals for the First and Ninth Circuits, and the U.S. Supreme Court.

BRIAN MURRAY, the managing partner of the Firm's New York office, was admitted to the bars of Connecticut in 1990, New York and the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York in 1991, the Second Circuit in 1997, the First and Fifth Circuits in 2000, the Ninth Circuit in 2002, and the Eastern and Western Districts of Arkansas in 2011. He received Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts degrees from the University of Notre Dame in 1983 and 1986, respectively. He received a Juris Doctor degree, *cum laude*, from St. John's University School of Law in 1990. At St. John's, he was the Articles Editor of the ST. JOHN'S LAW REVIEW. Mr. Murray co-wrote: *Jurisdição Estrangeira Tem Papel Relevante Na De Fiesa De Investidores Brasileiros*, ESPAÇA JURÍDICO BOVESPA (August 2008); *The Proportionate Trading Model: Real Science or Junk Science?*, 52 CLEVELAND ST. L. REV. 391 (2004-05); *The Accident of Efficiency: Foreign Exchanges, American Depository Receipts, and Space Arbitrage*, 51 BUFFALO L. REV. 383 (2003); *You Shouldn't Be Required To Plead More Than You Have To Prove*, 53 BAYLOR L. REV. 783 (2001); *He Lies, You Die: Criminal Trials, Truth, Perjury, and Fairness*, 27 NEW ENGLAND J. ON CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CONFINEMENT 1 (2001); *Subject Matter Jurisdiction Under the Federal Securities Laws: The State of Affairs After Itoba*, 20 MARYLAND J. OF INT'L L. AND TRADE 235 (1996); *Determining Excessive Trading in Option Accounts: A Synthetic Valuation Approach*, 23 U. DAYTON L. REV. 316 (1997); *Loss Causation Pleading Standard*, NEW YORK LAW JOURNAL (Feb. 25, 2005); *The PSLRA 'Automatic Stay' of Discovery*, NEW YORK LAW JOURNAL (March 3, 2003); and *Inherent Risk In Securities Cases In The Second Circuit*, NEW YORK LAW JOURNAL (Aug. 26, 2004). He also authored *Protecting The Rights of International Clients in U.S. Securities Class Action Litigation*, INTERNATIONAL LITIGATION NEWS (Sept. 2007); *Lifting the PSLRA "Automatic Stay" of Discovery*, 80 N. DAK. L. REV. 405 (2004); *Aftermarket Purchaser Standing Under § 11 of the Securities Act of 1933*, 73 ST. JOHN'S L. REV. 633 (1999); *Recent Rulings Allow Section 11 Suits By Aftermarket Securities Purchasers*, NEW YORK LAW JOURNAL (Sept. 24, 1998); and *Comment, Weissmann v. Freeman: The Second Circuit Errs in its Analysis of Derivative Copy-rights by Joint Authors*, 63 ST. JOHN'S L. REV. 771 (1989).

Mr. Murray was on the trial team that prosecuted a securities fraud case under Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 against Microdyne Corporation in the Eastern District of Virginia and he was also on the trial team that presented a claim under Section 14 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 against Artek Systems Corporation and Dynatach Group which settled midway through the trial.

Mr. Murray's major cases include *In re Eagle Bldg. Tech. Sec. Litig.*, 221 F.R.D. 582 (S.D. Fla. 2004), 319 F. Supp. 2d 1318 (S.D. Fla. 2004) (complaint against auditor sustained due to magnitude and nature of fraud; no allegations of a "tip-off" were necessary); *In re Turkcell Iletisim A.S. Sec. Litig.*, 209 F.R.D. 353 (S.D.N.Y. 2002) (defining standards by which investment advisors have standing to sue); *In re Turkcell Iletisim A.S. Sec. Litig.*, 202 F. Supp. 2d 8 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (liability found for false statements in prospectus concerning churn rates); *Feiner v. SS&C Tech., Inc.*, 11 F. Supp. 2d 204 (D. Conn. 1998) (qualified independent underwriters held liable for pricing of offering); *Malone v. Microdyne Corp.*, 26 F.3d 471 (4th Cir. 1994) (reversal of directed verdict for defendants); and *Adair v. Bristol Tech. Systems, Inc.*, 179 F.R.D. 126 (S.D.N.Y. 1998) (aftermarket purchasers have standing under section 11 of the Securities Act of 1933). Mr. Murray also prevailed on an issue of first impression in the

Superior Court of Massachusetts, in *Cambridge Biotech Corp. v. Deloitte and Touche LLP*, in which the court applied the doctrine of continuous representation for statute of limitations purposes to accountants for the first time in Massachusetts. 6 Mass. L. Rptr. 367 (Mass. Super. Jan. 28, 1997). In addition, in *Adair v. Microfield Graphics, Inc.* (D. Or.), Mr. Murray settled the case for 47% of estimated damages. In the *Qiao Xing Universal Telephone* case, claimants received 120% of their recognized losses.

Among his current cases, Mr. Murray represents the West Virginia Investments Management Board in a major litigation against ResidentialAccredit Loans, Deutsche Bank, and Credit Suisse. Mr. Murray is also currently co-lead counsel in *Avenarius, et al., v. Eaton Corp., et al.* (D. Del.), an antitrust class action against the world's largest commercial truck and transmission manufactures.

Mr. Murray served as a Trustee of the Incorporated Village of Garden City (2000-2002); Commissioner of Police for Garden City (2000-2001); Co-Chairman, Derivative Suits Subcommittee, American Bar Association Class Action and Derivative Suits Committee, (2007-Present); Member, Sports Law Committee, Association of the Bar for the City of New York, 1994-1997; Member, Litigation Committee, Association of the Bar for the City of New York, 2003-2007; Member, New York State Bar Association Committee on Federal Constitution and Legislation, 2005-2008; Member, Federal Bar Council, Second Circuit Committee, 2007-present.

Mr. Murray has been a panelist at CLEs sponsored by the Federal Bar Council and the Institute for Law and Economic Policy, at the German-American Lawyers Association Annual Meeting in Frankfurt, Germany, and is a frequent lecturer before institutional investors in Europe and South America on the topic of class actions.

ROBERT V. PRONGAY is a partner in the Firm's Los Angeles office where he focuses on the investigation, initiation, and prosecution of complex securities cases on behalf of institutional and individual investors. Mr. Prongay's practice concentrates on actions to recover investment losses resulting from violations of the federal securities laws and various actions to vindicate shareholder rights in response to corporate and fiduciary misconduct.

Mr. Prongay has extensive experience litigating complex cases in state and federal courts nationwide. Since joining the Firm, Mr. Prongay has successfully recovered millions of dollars for investors victimized by securities fraud and has negotiated the implementation of significant corporate governance reforms aimed at preventing the recurrence of corporate wrongdoing.

Several of Mr. Prongay's cases have received national and regional press coverage. Mr. Prongay has been interviewed by journalists and writers for national and industry publications, ranging from *The Wall Street Journal* to the *Los Angeles Daily Journal*. Mr. Prongay recently appeared as a guest on Bloomberg Television where he was interviewed about the securities litigation stemming from the high-profile initial public offering of Facebook, Inc.

Mr. Prongay received his Bachelor of Arts degree in Economics from the University of Southern California and his Juris Doctor degree from Seton Hall University School of Law. Mr. Prongay is also an alumnus of the Lawrenceville School.

KEVIN F. RUF graduated from the University of California at Berkeley in 1984 with a Bachelor of Arts in Economics and earned his Juris Doctor degree from the University of Michigan in 1987. Mr. Ruf was admitted to the State Bar of California in 1988. Mr. Ruf was an associate at the Los Angeles firm Manatt Phelps and Phillips from 1988 until 1992, where he specialized in commercial litigation and was a leading trial lawyer among the associates there. In 1993, he joined the firm Corbin & Fitzgerald in order to gain experience in criminal law. There, he specialized in white collar criminal defense work, including matters related to National Medical Enterprises, Cynergy Film Productions and the Estate of Doris Duke. Mr. Ruf joined the Firm in 2001 and has taken a lead trial lawyer role in many of the Firm's cases. In 2006, Mr. Ruf argued before the California Supreme Court in the case *Smith v. L'Oreal* and achieved a unanimous reversal of the lower court rulings; the case established a fundamental right of all California workers to immediate payment of all earnings at the conclusion of employment. In 2007, Mr. Ruf took an important case before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, convincing the Court to affirm the lower court's certification of a class action in a fraud case (fraud cases have traditionally faced difficulty as class actions because of the requirement of individual reliance). Mr. Ruf has extensive trial experience, including jury trials, and considers his courtroom and oral advocacy skills to be his strongest asset as a litigator. Mr. Ruf currently acts as the Head of the Firm's Labor and Consumer Practice, and has extensive experience in securities cases as well. Mr. Ruf also has experience in real estate law and has been a Licensed California Real Estate Broker since 1999.

EX KANO S. SAMS II earned his Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science from the University of California Los Angeles. Mr. Sams earned his Juris Doctor degree from the University of California Los Angeles School of Law, where he served as a member of the UCLA Law Review. After law school, Mr. Sams practiced class action civil rights litigation on behalf of plaintiffs. Subsequently, Mr. Sams was a partner at Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins LLP (currently Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP) – the largest plaintiffs' class action firm in the country – where his practice focused on securities and consumer class actions on behalf of investors and consumers.

Mr. Sams has served as lead counsel in dozens of securities class actions, shareholder derivative actions, and complex litigation cases throughout the United States. In conjunction with the efforts of co-counsel, Mr. Sams briefed and successfully obtained the reversal in the Ninth Circuit of an order dismissing class action claims brought pursuant to Sections 11 and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933. *Hemmer Grp. v. SouthWest Water Co.*, No. 11-56154, 2013 WL 2460197 (9th Cir. June 7, 2013). In another securities case that he actively litigated, Mr. Sams assisted in a successful appeal before a Fifth Circuit panel that included former United States Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor sitting by designation, in which the court unanimously vacated the lower court's denial of class certification, reversed the lower court's grant of summary judgment, and issued an important decision on the issue of loss causation in securities litigation: *Alaska Electrical Pension Fund v. Flowserve Corp.*, 572 F.3d 221 (5th Cir. 2009). The case settled for \$55 million.

Mr. Sams has also obtained other significant results. Notable examples include: *Forbush v. Goodale*, No. 33538/2011, 2013 WL 582255 (N.Y. Sup. Feb. 4, 2013) (denying motions to dismiss in a shareholder derivative action); *Curry v. Hansen Med., Inc.*, No. C 09-5094 CW, 2012 WL 3242447 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 10, 2012) (upholding securities fraud complaint; case settled

for \$8.5 million); *Wilkof v. Caraco Pharm. Labs., Ltd.*, 280 F.R.D. 332 (E.D. Mich. 2012) (granting class certification); *Puskala v. Koss Corp.*, 799 F. Supp. 2d 941 (E.D. Wis. 2011) (upholding securities fraud complaint); *Mishkin v. Zynex Inc.*, Civil Action No. 09-cv-00780-REB-KLM, 2011 WL 1158715 (D. Colo. Mar. 30, 2011) (denying defendants' motion to dismiss securities fraud complaint); *Wilkof v. Caraco Pharm. Labs., Ltd.*, No. 09-12830, 2010 WL 4184465 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 21, 2010) (upholding securities fraud complaint and cited favorably by the Eighth Circuit in *Public Pension Fund Grp. v. KV Pharm. Co.*, 679 F.3d 972, 981-82 (8th Cir. 2012)); and *Tsirekidze v. Syntax-Brilliant Corp.*, No. CV-07-02204-PHX-FJM, 2009 WL 2151838 (D. Ariz. July 17, 2009) (granting class certification; case settled for \$10 million).

Additionally, Mr. Sams has successfully represented consumers in class action litigation. Mr. Sams worked on nationwide litigation and a trial against major tobacco companies, and in statewide tobacco litigation that resulted in a \$12.5 billion recovery for California cities and counties in a landmark settlement. He also was a principal attorney in a consumer class action against one of the largest banks in the country that resulted in a substantial recovery and a change in the company's business practices. Mr. Sams also participated in settlement negotiations on behalf of environmental organizations along with the United States Department of Justice and the Ohio Attorney General's Office that resulted in a consent decree requiring a company to perform remediation measures to address the effects of air and water pollution.

Mr. Sams is a member of the John M. Langston Bar Association, as well as other local and business bar associations. Additionally, Mr. Sams has volunteered at community legal clinics to provide pro bono legal services to low-income and underrepresented individuals in South Central Los Angeles. Mr. Sams also serves as a mentor to law students through the John M. Langston Bar Association.

KARA M. WOLKE's practice spans consumer, labor, securities, and other areas of complex class action prosecution. She has extensive experience in written appellate advocacy in both State and Federal Circuit Courts of Appeals, and has successfully argued before the Court of Appeals for the State of California.

Ms. Wolke graduated summa cum laude with a B.S.B.A. in Economics from The Ohio State University in 2001, and subsequently earned her J.D. (with honors) from Ohio State, where she was active in Moot Court and received the Dean's Award for Excellence during each of her three years. In 2005, she was a finalist in a national writing competition co-sponsored by the American Bar Association and the Grammy® Foundation. Her article, regarding United States Copyright Law's failure to provide a public performance right in sound recordings, is published at 7 Vand. J. Ent. L. & Prac. 411.

Since joining the firm in 2005, and becoming a partner in 2014, Ms. Wolke has aided in the prosecution of class action cases which have recovered hundreds of millions of dollars for injured investors, consumers, and employees, including: *Schleicher, et al. v. Wendt, et al.* (Conseco), Case No. 02-cv-1332 (S.D. Ind.) (\$41.5 million securities class action settlement); *Lapin v. Goldman Sachs*, Case No. 03-850 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$29 million securities class action settlement); *In Re: Mannkind Corporation Securities Litigation*, Case No. 11-929 (C.D. Cal) (approximately \$22 million settlement - \$16 million in cash plus stock); *Jenson v. First Trust Corporation*, Case No. 05-3124 (C.D. Cal.) (\$8.5 million settlement of class action alleging

breach of fiduciary duty and breach of contract); and *Pappas v. Naked Juice Co.*, Case No. 11-08276 (C.D. Cal.) (\$9 million settlement in consumer class action alleging misleading labeling of juice products as “All Natural”). With a background in intellectual property, Ms. Wolke is currently prosecuting a class action seeking to have a large music publisher’s claim of copyright ownership over the song “Happy Birthday to You” declared invalid.

Ms. Wolke is admitted to the State Bar of California, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, as well as the United States District Courts for the Northern, Southern, and Central Districts of California.

SENIOR COUNSEL

GREGORY B. LINKH works out of the New York office, where he specializes in securities, shareholder derivative, antitrust, and consumer litigation. Greg graduated from the State University of New York at Binghamton in 1996 and from the University of Michigan Law School in 1999. While in law school, Greg externed with United States District Judge Gerald E. Rosen of the Eastern District of Michigan. Greg was previously associated with the law firms Dewey Ballantine LLP, Pomerantz Haudek Block Grossman & Gross LLP, and Murray Frank LLP.

Greg is the co-author of *Inherent Risk In Securities Cases In The Second Circuit*, NEW YORK LAW JOURNAL (Aug. 26, 2004); *Staying Derivative Action Pursuant to PSLRA and SLUSA*, NEW YORK LAW JOURNAL, P. 4, COL. 4 (Oct. 21, 2005) and the *SECURITIES REFORM ACT LITIGATION REPORTER*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (Dec. 2005).

OF COUNSEL

PETER A. BINKOW has prosecuted lawsuits on behalf of consumers and investors in state and federal courts throughout the United States. He served as Lead or Co-Lead Counsel in many class action cases, including: *In re Mercury Interactive Securities Litigation* (\$117.5 million recovery); *Schleicher v Wendt* (Conseco Securities litigation - \$41.5 million recovery); *Lapin v Goldman Sachs* (\$29 million recovery); *In re Heritage Bond Litigation* (\$28 million recovery); *In re National Techteam Securities Litigation* (\$11 million recovery for investors); *In re Lason Inc. Securities Litigation* (\$12.68 million recovery), *In re ESC Medical Systems, Ltd. Securities Litigation* (\$17 million recovery); and many others. In *Schleicher v Wendt*, Mr. Binkow successfully argued the seminal Seventh Circuit case on class certification, in an opinion authored by Chief Judge Frank Easterbrook. He has argued and/or prepared appeals before the Ninth Circuit, Seventh Circuit, Sixth Circuit and Second Circuit Courts of Appeals.

Mr. Binkow joined the Firm in 1994. He was born on August 16, 1965 in Detroit, Michigan. Mr. Binkow obtained a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Michigan in 1988 and a Juris Doctor degree from the University of Southern California in 1994.

MICHAEL M. GOLDBERG specializes in federal securities, federal and state antitrust, and consumer fraud class action lawsuits. He has successfully litigated numerous cases which resulted in multi-million dollar recoveries for investors, consumers and businesses.

Mr. Goldberg was born in New York on April 27, 1966. He earned his Bachelor of Arts degree in 1989 from Pitzer College of The Claremont Colleges, and his Juris Doctor degree in 1996 from Thomas M. Cooley Law School. After graduating from law school, Mr. Goldberg joined the Firm. He was admitted to both the California and Florida bars in 1997 and is admitted to practice in numerous courts.

ASSOCIATES

ELAINE CHANG graduated from the University of California, Berkeley with a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration and a Bachelor of Arts degree in Economics. Ms. Chang received her Juris Doctor degree from the UCLA School of Law, where she was on the editorial board of the *UCLA Journal of Law and Technology* and the *Asian Pacific American Law Journal*, as well as a member of the UCLA Moot Court Honors Board. While in law school, Ms. Chang also externed for the Honorable Gary A. Feess in the Central District of California.

Prior to law school, Ms. Chang worked on a number of financial reporting and securities fraud investigations at a big four accounting firm. Ms. Chang also worked in the marketing and product management department at an investment management firm in New York.

PHILIP S. GUTIERREZ joined Glancy Prongay & Murray LLP in 2012. He is an associate at the Firm's Los Angeles office, and he specializes in securities, consumer, and anti-trust litigation. Prior to joining the firm, Mr. Gutierrez was an attorney at the Alliance for Children's Rights and worked in the Office of the General Counsel at Children's Hospital Los Angeles. Mr. Gutierrez also worked at AIG SunAmerica for 3 years as a Regional Marketing Specialist.

Mr. Gutierrez graduated magna cum laude from the University of Southern California with a B.A. in Psychology and a minor in Law. He received his J.D. from the University of Southern California Gould School of Law. While attending law school, Mr. Gutierrez was a Content Editor for the Southern California Review of Law and Social Justice. His article *You Have the Right to [Plead Guilty]: How We Can Stop Police Interrogations from Inducing False Confessions* was published in the journal.

Mr. Gutierrez is a Los Angeles native.

LEANNE HEINE SOLISH joined Glancy Prongay & Murray LLP in 2012. Leanne graduated *summa cum laude* from Tulane University with a B.S.M. in Accounting and Finance in 2007, and she received her J.D. from the University of Texas School of Law in 2011. While attending law school, Leanne was an editor for the Texas International Law Journal, a student attorney for the Immigration and Worker Rights Clinics, and she externed with MALDEF and the Texas Civil Rights Project. Leanne is a member of the Beta Gamma Sigma Business Honors Society. She is a registered CPA in Illinois, and was admitted to the California State Bar in 2011.

THOMAS J. KENNEDY works out of the New York office, where he specializes in securities, antitrust, and consumer litigation. He received a Juris Doctor degree from St. John's University School of Law in 1995. At St. John's, he was a member of the ST. JOHN'S JOURNAL OF

LEGAL COMMENTARY. Tom graduated from Miami University in 1992 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Accounting and has passed the CPA exam. Tom was previously associated with the law firm Murray Frank LLP.

JARED F. PITT joined Glancy Prongay & Murray LLP in 2012 specializing in securities, consumer, and anti-trust litigation. Prior to joining the firm, Jared was an associate at Willoughby Doyle LLP and was a senior financial statement auditor for KMPG LLP where he earned his CPA license.

Jared earned his J.D. from Loyola Law School in 2010. Prior to attending law school he graduated with honors from both the University of Michigan's Ross School of Business and USC's Marshall School of Business where he received a Masters of Accounting.

LESLEY F. PORTNOY joined the firm in 2014. He has represented clients throughout the country in securities litigation and class actions. Mr. Portnoy has previously served as counsel to investors in Bernard L. Madoff securities, assisting the SIPC trustee Irving Picard in recovering money on behalf of defrauded investors. During law school, he worked in the New York Supreme Court Commercial Division, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, and the New York City Law Department. Mr. Portnoy has represented pro bono clients in New York and California. In his time off, he enjoys cycling, reading, sports, and spending time with his wife and three children.

CASEY E. SADLER is a native of New York, New York. After graduating from the University of Southern California, Gould School of Law, Mr. Sadler joined the Firm in 2010. While attending law school, Mr. Sadler externed for the Enforcement Division of the Securities and Exchange Commission, spent a summer working for P.H. Parekh & Co. -- one of the leading appellate law firms in New Delhi, India -- and was a member of USC's Hale Moot Court Honors Program.

Mr. Sadler is an associate in the Firm's Los Angeles office and he specializes in securities and consumer litigation. Mr. Sadler is admitted to the State Bar of California, and the United States District Courts for the Northern, Southern, and Central Districts of California.

BRIAN S. UMPIERRE has specialized in class action, consumer and antitrust litigation since his admission to the California Bar in 2005, where he is a member of the Antitrust and Unfair Competition Section of the California Bar. While in law school at Villanova University School of Law, Mr. Umpierre was an extern for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Region III in Philadelphia, PA. He graduated from the University of Scranton, where he was a member of Alpha Kappa Delta, the International Sociology Honor Society.

EXHIBIT 2

INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

Name/Status	Hourly Rate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Hours	Lodestar
														0.0	\$ -
Susan Kupfer, P	\$ 725.00	5.0		3.0						2.0				10.0	\$ 7,250.00
Michael Goldberg	\$ 695.00	5.0												5.0	\$ 3,475.00
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
Alexandra Lubkin	\$ 160.00								8.0					8.0	\$ 1,280.00
														0.0	\$ -
Tia Reiss PL	\$ 195.00								2.5					2.5	\$ 487.50
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
		10.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.5	\$ 12,492.50

INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

Firm Name	Glancy Binkow & Goldberg LLP	
Reporting Year	2008	

[illegible]

INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

Firm Name	Glancy Binkow & Goldberg LLP	
Reporting Year	2009	

[illegible]

TIME AND LODESTAR SUMMARY

INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

Firm Name	Glancy Binkow & Goldberg LLP	
Reporting Year	2010	

[illegible]

INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

Firm Name	Glancy Binkow & Goldberg LLP	
Reporting Year	2012	

[illegible]

INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

Firm Name	Glancy Binkow & Goldberg LLP	
Reporting Year	2013	

[illegible]

INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

Firm Name	Glancy Binkow & Goldberg LLP	
Reporting Year	2014	

[illegible]

INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

Firm Name	Glancy Prongay & Murray LLP (3/1/2015)
Reporting Year	2015

[illegible]

TIME AND LODESTAR SUMMARY

INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

Firm Name	Glancy Binkow & Goldberg, now Glancy Prongay & Murray
Reporting Year	Inception through Present

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Hours	Lodestar
2007	10.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.5	\$ 12,492.50
2008	6.3	0.0	22.9	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.1	0.0	0.0	59.3	\$ 28,730.50
2009	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	283.2	0.0	0.0	289.0	\$ 148,427.50
2010	0.0	3.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	68.2	0.0	1.3	97.4	0.0	0.0	171.4	\$ 82,327.00
2011	7.0	0.0	1.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	222.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	233.9	\$ 93,753.50
2012	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1394.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1395.7	\$ 557,147.50
2013	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1616.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	1619.4	\$ 648,622.50
2014	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1555.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	1561.0	\$ 626,387.50
2015	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	\$ 2,150.00
	29.8	3.0	28.4	12.3	3172.6	0.0	1685.3	10.5	6.8	410.0	0.0	0.0	5358.7	\$ 2,200,038.50

STATUS:

(P) Partner
(OC) Of Counsel
(A) Associate
(LC) Law Clerk
(PL) Paralegal
(I) Investigator

CATEGORIES:

1 Attorney Meeting/Strategy
2 Court Appearance
3 Client Meeting
4 Draft Discovery Requests or Responses
5 Deposition Preparation
6 Attend Deposition - Conduct/Defend
7 Document Review
8 Experts - Work or Consult
9 Research
10 Motions/Pleadings
11 Settlement
12 Trial

EXHIBIT 3

EXPENSE SUMMARY

INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

Firm Name	Glancy Prongay & Murray LLP
Reporting Year	Inception through Present

TYPE OF EXPENSE		TOTAL
Assessments		\$ 45,000.00
Outside Copies		
In-house Reproduction /Copies		
Court Costs & Filing Fees		\$ 502.84
Court Reporters 7 Transcripts		
Computer Research		\$ 2,721.73
Telephone & Facsimile		\$ 130.92
Postage/Express Delivery/Courier		\$ 165.50
Professional Fees (investigator, accountant, etc.)		
Experts		
Witness / Service Fees		
Travel: Airfare		\$ 497.60
Travel: Lodging/Meals		\$ 2,947.25
Travel: Other		
Car Rental/Cabfare/Parking		\$ 12.00
Other Expenses		
		\$ 51,977.84